

THE MOTIVE POWER OF THE CIRCULATION OF
THE BLOOD.

In vegetables, and particularly in the gigantic forest trees of some countries, there is a much more magnificent circulation of liquids going on than in the body of any person or animal, and yet there is neither heart nor any mechanical engine in them to propel the sap to the height of from one to three hundred feet. But, as there can be no effect without a cause, so there must also be a cause (the same as in animals and man) of the circulation in vegetables: for

Popular Theories of the Cause of the Circulation.

Dr. CARPENTIER (*Human Physiology*), after showing most conclusively that the blood circulates in human beings after the muscular tissue of the heart has been almost entirely destroyed by disease without any such disturbance of the circulation as would be expected, and in the fœtus entirely destitute of a heart, &c., invokes the aid of the contraction of the voluntary muscles, the contractility of the blood-vessels, the pressure of the atmosphere, and, above all, the chemical action which takes place in the capillaries preparatory to the process of nutrition, to break the chain of causation and repair the links he had just destroyed. It should here be remembered that the heart of the mother cannot produce the least direct muscular or mechanical effect upon the circulation of the fœtus; for the blood of the former does not enter the blood-vessels of the latter, each having its own appropriate circulation. The blood of the fœtus is carried by its vessels to the fetal portion of the placenta and returns to it through the umbilical veins; while the blood of the mother only enters the maternal portion of the placenta and then returns; and these two portions of the placenta are separated by a double layer of cells (vesicles) through which the vivifying agent is transferred from the mother to her offspring. Moreover, in the embryo there is a circulation before the heart is developed, and the blood is formed in and passes from the vascular area to every part of the embryo, instead of from the region of the heart.

This theory effectually refuted by a single physical fact, ascertained by direct experiments made by Dr. ARNOTT. But there is no such thing as a suction pump, either in nature or art, as any person may convince himself by sealing the pipe of a syringe airtight into the mouth of a bottle perfectly full of water and then trying to pump the water perpendicularly upwards and failing to do so. The effect attributed to suction is produced thus: When the air is exhausted from any vessel, one end of which is immersed in a liquid, the atmospheric pressure is removed from that part of the surface of the liquid which is within the walls of the vessel, and if no air can enter into the vessel above the liquid the pressure of the atmosphere upon the surface of the liquid outside of it drives this liquid into the vessel to the height of from thirty-two to thirty-four feet, according to the intensity of the atmospheric pressure indicated by the barometer. Now, Dr. Arnott has proved experimentally that when a perfectly flexible tube, such as a piece of a blood-vessel,

to the perpendicular height at which the column of the liquid stands. Hence, if the liquid is in motion, and there is any resistance to its passage from friction or other causes, (and when the tortuosity of the blood-vessels, &c. is considered, it is manifest that the resistance to the passage of the blood must be very great, as the Professor's words imply,) which must be overcome by a force applied to the liquid, the vessels containing it sustain the greatest bursting force at the point where the propelling force is applied. Consequently, if the Professor's theory be true, the capillaries must sustain a pressure equivalent to the whole force that circulates the blood and overcomes the resistance to its passage; and

acting throughout the circulatory system, sanguineous, lymphatic, chyliferous, seminal, &c.

Dr. MACALLAN, of Georgetown, D. C., has recently published critical notes on Carpenter's Human Physiology, which contain a theory of the circulation based upon the supposition that the heart and arteries enlarge their diameters by "the active elongation" of the muscular fibres of these organs every time a renewed flood of blood enters them; and that the blood enters them (is driven into them by atmospheric pressure, I suppose, for nothing else could do it) to prevent a vacuum, and then propelled forward by "the passive contraction" of the muscular fibres of those organs. The fact determined by Dr. ANSTON, already adduced to invalidate Baron LIEBIG's theory, militates with equal force against this. The Doctor's theory regarding muscular contraction in general, on which his theory of the circulation is based, is, that the arm, for instance, is bent "by the active elongation" of those muscles, termed *extensors* by anatomists, which lie on the outside of the arm, while those muscles on the inside of the arm, termed *flexors*, relax passively, and have no active agency in bending the arm, but only in straightening it, and vice versa. According to this theory the effect produced by muscular action is a consequence of their elongation, not of their contraction, as stated by all other physiologists. Now, every person can easily convince himself of the fallacy of this theory by taking hold of a fixed object, and with his arm semi-flexed draw himself actively towards the object, while he braces his foot against it. On then examining the state of the muscles above the elbow with the other hand, while his muscles are in this active state, he will find the flexors

The only additional theory that claims attention is that first promulgated by Mrs. WILLARD, and since defended by Dr. CARTWRIGHT, namely: "That respiration, operating by animal heat, produces an expansive power at the lungs, and thus becomes the principal efficient cause the blood's circulation." "That atmospheric air admitted into the lungs is the blood-moving-power."

This theory, though plausible because a direct inference from observed facts, is disproved by many other facts. Air alone possesses no motive power whatever; cannot move itself, much less can it communicate motion to other bodies, unless first put in motion by extrinsic agency. Physiologists have lost sight entirely of the fact that the atmosphere contains at all times a considerable quantity of free electricity, to which alone the primary cause of the movement of nature—attraction and repulsion—long; and that more is set in motion when the oxygen and nitrogen come to be separated in the lungs, the former gas entering the blood, while the latter is inspired with the carbonic acid formed in the arteries by the combination of the oxygen with the carbon and hydrogen of the food. The air, therefore, is not the motor agent of the blood, but only the vehicle of that agent. But this is anticipating what will hereafter be elucidated in several articles.

I have thus assailed in review all the theories of the circulation that have come under my notice, and offered a few objections, while a score fatal to it might be urged against each. As the heart is still considered the sole or at least the principal agent in propelling the blood, the objections against this theory have been reserved for a second communication, after which my own theory will receive attention in several numbers.

H. R. SCHEFFELY.
GRAND TRAVERSE DAY, MICHIGAN.

SCHOOL BOOKS, in great variety, for sale by TAYLOR & MAURT, Pennsylvania avenue, near Ninth street.

THE NEBRASKA QUESTION.

[illegible]

fifth section of the bill provides:

"That every free white male inhabitant above the age of twenty years, who shall be an actual resident of said Territory, and shall possess the qualifications hereinafter prescribed, shall be entitled to vote at the first election, and shall be eligible to any office within the said Territory, but no person shall be elected or hold any office until he has taken the oath of voters and of holding office at all sessions of the Legislature; provided, That the right of suffrage shall be exercised only by citizens of the United States."

And those who shall have declared on oath their intention to become such, and shall have taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of the laws thereof, and *and provided further, That no officer, soldier, seaman, or other person in the army or navy of the United States, or attached to troops in the service of the United States, shall be allowed to vote or hold office in said Territory on being on service therein.*"

[illegible]

denied the elective franchise, while the thousands of thousands who are pouring upon our country from every part of God's habitable globe will be excluded from the franchise. Why, sir, if State A has expelled from it a man, why should State B be obliged to take up his residence in one of these Territories to vote the day after he gets there if this bill be passed? The name of a citizen of this country is embroiled on this country's history, and whose impression is made on the minds of the people of this country, so, if he was there stationed at the order of the Government, would not be allowed the same privilege as the Senators if it is not so, that by the protection we are about to say to the General-in-Chief, we are about to say to the soldiers of the army, and to the deserter from the army, you may vote! Shall we do this? Shall we say to the venerable soldier who has served his country for forty years, who has fought nine battles and has been in every war, anything man, shall we say to the old soldier, who was with us at the battle of Gettysburg, shall we say to him, you are no longer a citizen, you deserve his country's gratitude, you shall be sent to Kansas or Nebraska; and then shall we say to the thousands of the Old World, to the wanderers at sea, to the prison-birds and spawn of infamy, shall we say to them, you are citizens, you are entitled to the franchise to foreigners. We invite them to our shores, we receive them kindly and treat them generously, and then we say to them, you are no longer men I am asked to stand up in the American Senate and say to foreigners the right of suffrage, and I say to them, you are no longer citizens, I say to them, you are no longer men.

heard before of putting foreigners on an equal footing with Americans, but this is the first time we were called upon to give them an advantage. The reason assigned is—Look at the bill. No foreigner is to be admitted to the Territory without a certificate of his moral character. The bill is passed by reason of his being on service there. The reason for his exclusion from the polls that he can't use the country's arms, that he encounters the dangers and the perils of the battle-field, that a foreigner is not to be admitted to the Territory without a certificate of his moral character, and that he is to be put upon your laws and them as he means to obey. A citizen and swear to support your Constitution, and let him vote. A thousand soldiers, with Swords and Pistols, may be ordered to Nebraska to keep this bill passed, and not one of them can vote. The bill is passed, and the Territory they are to be put upon your laws and them as he means to obey. The next day abandon the Territory for ever. Now mark you, they are to declare their intention to become citizens of the United States, not of Nebraska. Scott or Wool, at the head of a company of men, guarding a thousand Irish or Dutch soldiers, march out of the country, and hear Pat O'Brien stand this land of liberty where foreigners vote. I can look on in silence!

...told, sir, by way of alarm on this subject, that I was sent back to the House it will be lost. I am not disposed to do that which my judgment does not approve. I am here as an American Senator, to vote with responsibility; and I must do so with the aid of the people. Now, Mr. President, we are asked to be a record which will tell the world that we are a nation of cowards. What do we every day? Why, sir, we are true to the records of the past and inquire what others have done who went before us? Do we always expect others to do as we do? I am confident the answer is, No. I am confident so many voted in the affirmative as to be in the negative. When the present passes away, it will be recorded against you; and you will be remembered as the man who refused to do it. I have been told that the President has received eight hundred and fifty-four, the majority, I deliberately, upon a motion to strike out so many, refused to do it by so many years to so many years. I am declaring to all the world that foreigners will not be deceived by the President of the United States and all the oath to support the Constitution while a citizen soldier may not, by reason of his position, do the same thing. I am confident the President you are making to-day. The Chinese are not deceived by the President of the United States; that this precedent may not come home to us with the double power of a political crucifixion of the interests, the rights, the honor of my country.

to our own citizens, if they are to be given the right to participate in the proceedings in any manner, shape, or form. If we have American citizens there, and they happen to be, they are to stand off and see their rights committed to foreigners. These foreigners are to interest in your country, may not have representation, and may be wholly incapable of feeling any interest in it. I will upon Senate action before they proceed further in this matter in this record will be brought up in future the records of our ancestors are brought up, and descendants will be told that because we did they may do it all time to come. I am not induced by this appeal to our fears. The House of Representatives may not do it, but that does not mean that we are to fail. I intend to do my best, and I am sure that I shall be remembered for his conscience, to his constituents, and to his country.

I have been told that a certain class of Senators vote to strike out this provision, though I do not know what these gentlemen mean. I am in their company or confidence; I have information why they do; they will show that at some future occasion; they are acting from honest convictions if they give the motion. The motion was formerly made by the Senator (Mr. CLAYTON) they all voted against it to go for it now, merely that they may embarrass their motives will; I know nothing about it, but believe they will; I know nothing about it, however they may do, I mean, as I said before, to my duty as an American Senator. I want to be distinctly that I do not wish to be chased about from one side to the other, just as they think proper to shape their course for a proposition and they against it, when in favor of it I am not bound to be against it; consistency in that. While I arraign the man, call no man's motives in question, I

that kind. It shall act upon our honest, conscientious convictions of what is right.

I said in the beginning that I had no speech to make on this subject, and I have none; but I cannot reconcile to my sense of right to vote for a proposition which gives the right of suffrage to a race of ignorant, degraded, and uneducated slaves, who are ignorant of the rights which chance has brought them to our shores, the right to vote in these Territories, and then deny the same right to any American citizen who may happen to be in the Territory in the service of the country as a soldier or officer in the army. I will not, I cannot do that. I do not believe that I shall ever be able to vote for the bill. Ever since I came into Congress I have been the firm and steadfast opponent of this Missouri restriction. Nay, sir, ever since I raised my voice as a politician, from my earliest service as a public man, I have warred against the extension of the great monstrous oppression upon the Constitution of the United States and upon the rights and honor of the Southern people. I am prepared to make many and very great sacrifices to get clear of this odious restriction, to vote for many things of which I cannot approve by way of getting clear of it; but I cannot vote for this Missouri restriction. I am sure that it is to be taken on this proposition separately and distinctly. It stands by itself, and is to be valid to the exclusion of every thing else. Now, our votes are to stand in all after time as an indication of our sentiments on this particular section of the bill, separately and distinctly. I am sure that the friends of the restriction will ask the question; and honorable Senators will see at once that it is a very important question.

I know verwell that frequently a bill like this, covering, as this does, thirty-seven pages of printed matter, and making in one of our daily newspapers some seven or eight columns, may pass without every member being able to read it. But, when a bill is brought up, and when a matter of this sort is brought up in bold letters before you, with a clear and distinct proposition to strike out a particular section, and the mind of every Senator is drawn distinctly to the language of it, it must be some great, powerful, overruling influence which would justify any Senator in refusing to give his vote to strike it out. If, in his heart, he thinks it wrong. I have seen no such influence appear. I think if the bill goes back to the House of Representatives, that it will be there, and I will agree to our amendment. If they disagree to it, a committee of conference is the necessary consequence; and, if, in the end, we must yield sooner than lose the bill that will be another proposition. Without a single member of the House being committed on this question in any shape or form, so far as the voting shows, and I to be told

of the bill. I feel none of our fear of apprehension; for you have the balance of this year before you in the Senate. There is no press of time. The session is not going to close in two or three days, and thus cut us off in the midst of our deliberations on this or other questions. I have heard no reason assigned yet why this bill may not at all times be brought up. This provision stricken out as with it all the things that are in the bill, and which I have heard nothing of the debate, will be lost to posterity, and nothing will remain of this transaction but the votes which we put upon the record. I put my vote there. I want to be a vote I can stand by to-morrow, next year and the year after, and which my children can stand by when shall be in my grave.

The bill will certainly be lost if it goes across to the House. I do not think it is a patriotic act of evidence to sustain it. Its friends are in a minority there; and if they are not the bill ought not to pass. If the bill were ten thousand times better than it is I would not have it become a law against the will of a majority.

For the reasons stated, and without determining the Senate longer, vote for the amendment, but with a purpose to destroy the bill. I have given as much evidence as most Senators that I am its friend. Things have been put into it which are objectionable to me. I have never denied, every one knows, that the provisions moved by the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Bagnall) were a part of the amendment proposed by the author of the bill was not exactly what I intended it all, however, and went for the bill. But when I was asked, by a separate and distinct vote, to sanction that kind of legislation embodied in this particular section now proposed to be stricken out, I must have stronger reasons than I have heard, or I will refuse to do so.

To vote for this bill is to vote for the restriction of it; for along with the repeal of the Missouri restriction it is another and very different thing.

Mr. BENJAMIN. The amendment now before the Senate, offered by the Senator from Maryland, commends itself to my deliberate judgment. I voted for it before I shall vote against it now. Having this intention, and feeling the necessity of making some explanation of the apparent inconsistency of my votes, I desire to say but a very few words to the Senate.

I am a witness that when this bill was first brought before the Senate, I remained a very attentive listener to the debates. I took no part in the discussion myself. If I had ever entertained a desire to do so the signal authority with which the bill was discussed, the deep historical research evinced by those who spoke both for and against it, and the massive force of argument by which it was sustained, would have been indicated by the advocates of the bill on this floor, were such persons to have made me shrink from entering into such an arena with my feeble lance. But, sir, my silence has been misconstrued in certain quarters; and although I have not even the poor excuse of necessity for defining my position to induce me to speak at the present time, inasmuch as upon the subject of the bill, I have been in the bill I feel certain that next year will be the truest.

of my constituency almost to a man, yet, as I have the misfortune to differ in that vote from the only delegate from my State in the other branch of Congress who belongs to the political party to which I have always adhered with unflinching constancy, I feel it due to myself and the people of my State to declare here the grounds very briefly, upon which my vote will be given, both upon the bill and upon the amendment.

Mr. President, what is the present position of the question before the Senate? We are all wandering from it, and I am, I think, the only Senator who has just addressed the Senate. Mr. Brown has introduced a bill for the organization of these Territories passed by the Senate and by the House. It went there with an amendment, which has been called the Clayton amendment, and which restricts the right of suffrage to persons who were citizens of the United States, as well as residents of the Territories. That bill, sir, has not been acted upon by the House. The House now before us comes to us as an original bill from the House, and it is such a bill as I have said to the Senate, and is subject to its entire control. The present question now pending is to engrave upon that bill the same amendment which was before placed upon it by the Senate after full discussion. The objection made to that is that the friends of the bill in the other branch of Congress inform us, and I believe truly, that if it goes back to the House, it will come with an amendment it will never pass either in the House or the Senate nor with any other. And why will it not pass?

It will not pass because members of the other branch are fatigued with the discussion which the bill has excited. It will not pass because already a very large portion of the session, which ought to have been devoted to other legislative measures, has been consumed with it. It will not pass because fresh discussions will arise, fresh exciting scenes will be provoked, and in order to avoid them some gentlemen who have voted for the bill will join with its opponents in laying it on the table. Such, I understand from quarters which I believe to be well informed upon the subject, and to whose representations I have much implicit belief, is the state of feeling in the other House.

I state the facts because the Senator from North Carolina yesterday, and the Senator from Mississippi to-morrow, declared that there is no evidence before the Senate to show that the bill cannot be passed in the other House with the amendment attached to it.

I never felt any inclination to enter into a statement or discussion of the reasons on which my vote was based. I have listened, I have listened to the honorable Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Hays) with great sympathy and pain. You have heard the discussion which he has taken place to day, and which cannot have failed to excite the most unpleasant sensations in your mind, sir, as well as in that of every Senator on this floor. The Senator from Tennessee told us, according to his own statement of the fact, that almost up to the moment at which he delivered his speech against the bill his mind was in doubt; that he had entertained either her hope or opinion, or perhaps it was that it was with the possibility of opposing it that it was with the possibility of opposing it that he withdrew himself from that band of Southern brethren with whom he had fought so long and so nobly. Now,

Mr. President after the utterance of sentiments like those, and after having accomplished a duty which, according to his representation, was so painful to him, I thought, for one, that that Senator would have been satisfied. His opposition he had already made to the bill, and when you see him in his place, and taunted the advocates of the bill, and then sneering and triumph called upon us to declare upon what ground we were supporting the bill, and what great principle we saw in it upon which we could base our votes in opposition to an amendment which we had before sustained, I must confess I listened to him with deep pain. The Senator seemed to subject every advocate of the bill to a separate special interrogatory. He called first upon the gentleman from New York, and then upon a third, and then upon a fourth, and then upon a fifth, and was going to vote against this amendment, and the great constitutional principle which he found in the bill, which was to be carried forward and carried through to the sacrifice of every other principle. It is not at all to be wondered at, sir, that in the hurry of the moment, and the excitement caused by interrogatories of that kind, the response

or as satisfactory as the friends of the bill would desire and it is because the response was not quite so full as satisfy my mind that I desire to say what are the principles which I, with my feeble intellect, and as a junior member of this Senate, have been able to eviscerate from the bill, and which seemed to have escaped the most practised acuteness and superior ability of the Senators.

Now, Mr. President, when I look at this bill for the purpose of ascertaining its principles, and that they stand out in such bold relief that they are *desiderata* of the people, I find, first, the obliteration of geographical line by which the two sections of the Confederacy have for upwards of thirty years been separated from each other. That line was one purely arbitrary; it was not a line of mountains, nor of rivers, nor of deep and broad straits, nor of any other natural barrier. The ideal line has been drawn, and the South has been torn by the North, "thus far shalt thou go and no further," and thus far will the different sections of this Confederacy blend together, and no further can they blend. It is a line, sir. It is one. I was going to say, of principle, but that is not the word. It is not a line of principle, as eloquently alluded to by the Senator from Virginia the other day—a line which, though ideal, as effectually separates the sections of the Confederacy as if it were a wall of adamant. When gentlemen from the South approach their friends from the North, on reaching this line the words, "My country," are uttered. It is not a line of Northern brethren in this bonds of fraternal affection and cordial sentiment which tends to actuate every man

ber of the Confederacy, it is as though a wall of ice were
intervened between them to chill their warmest and most
brotherly emotions. Sir, this geographical line is one of
the very points against which we are warned by the Father
of the Country when he made his farewell address to
the people of the United States. He said, "Beware, my
countrymen, from hence never again emerged into public life. I
warn you, to take a lax or strict construction of the
word or deed, should advocate, establish, or maintain any
thing like geographical divisions of the sections of the
Confederacy. Divide upon any thing else; take any prin-
ciple you please; take a lax or strict construction of the
Constitution; take internal improvements, be for them or
against them; protect or prohibit tariffs, be for them or
against them; but geographical lines are to be avoided by
us; and he who has the least interests of his country-
ports them as a traitor to the best interests of his country."
That, as I understand it, was the warning voice of the
Father of his Country in his Farewell Address. Here, then,
I find one great principle which of itself would recommend
this bill to my warmest support at all times and upon all

occasions.

When we look back to the compromise upon which the Constitution of this country was formed, what do we find there? We find but two points upon which the domestic institutions of the South were entrusted to the care of the General Government. One was the delegation of authority to interrupt the slave trade with this country after a certain period—and history has witnessed the wisdom of such a policy. The other was the United States took advantage of the first instance constitutionally to exercise that power for the purpose of prohibiting that trade—the other is that clause of the Constitution which protects the peculiar property of the South, and deprives the North of the power to confiscate it. We escape from the owner's custody into a Northern State, and we are safe. We are not to be deprived of our constitutional power over the subject; and the power which it is the duty of this Government to exercise, and which it has exercised in good faith. When you have gone through these two enumerated grants of power, you have gone through all that the Constitution will give you in the way of constitutional authority, which we find in the Constitution. We find that, from the very foundation of the Government, from the period at which the Congress of the United States first began to legislate for the country up to that unfortunate year, 1820, a cardinal principle of our fathers was that the Congress of the United States had no right to legislate upon the subject of slavery at all outside of the limits of the Constitution. There was no constitutional controversy and the heated feeling, the excited state of mind existing between the North and the South, never did arise, and never could arise, so long as the Congress of the United States, looking to the Constitution of the United States as its charter, confined its action to the legitimate legislation which the framers of the Constitution intended it should exercise.

I find, then, that this bill, retracing the steps of Federal legislation, so far as it interfered with this subject matter from the year 1820 to the present hour, proposes to go back to the traditions of the fathers. It proposes to put the people of the United States back to the position they occupied up to the year 1820. It proposes to announce, as a principle, to the people of the United States, that the General Government is not to legislate at all upon this question of slavery. It is not to legislate to extend it; it is not to legislate to restrict it; it is not to legislate to brand the flaming sword ought to guard all access to; no impious foot ought to endeavor to tread within its sacred precincts. That is the principle which I find in this bill, and that is the principle which I wish to see established in the minds of the people of the United States. I wish to see that there be no vain for fanatics, either North or South, to endeavor to create any permanent excitement in the minds of the American people. The ailment will be gone. You may fight the flame, but the fire will be wanting. It may die out of itself, and then there will be no more to fight. I wish to see that we be patient with the taunts thrown out this day by the Senator from Ohio: then alone shall we be able to hear with composure his threat that his war-cry is issued against the South from this time forward, and that all his energies will be directed to repeat the same, and overthrow the principles upon which it is based.

Let the American people understand this subject in its

free bearing; let the North once be disabused of the false impression that the South desires any advantage over the North in the matter of slavery. Let us be satisfied that our friends in the Northern States once be convinced that all we ask and desire is the simple privilege of being left alone; and can we ask less? Blessed or cursed, as you please, with an institution which we find established by the laws of God, and which we find to be the only one that exists when we descend to our graves, an institution which we so firmly knit among us that it cannot be torn out of us without tearing up the very heart strings of society, is it wonderful, is it unreasonable, is it not most reasonable and just, that we should desire to be left alone to manage our own affairs? Is it not a simple and reasonable thing for us to desire that the Confederacy simply to let us alone? We ask of you that the passage of no law, we ask of you the enactment of no statute, any further than to put us back just in that position occupied by our fathers when they acted upon the principle of leaving us alone of managing each section of the country for itself, of establishing and maintaining our own internal domestic institutions and promote its own happiness as it sees proper. Here is, then, a second general principle which I see in this bill, and for the establishment of which I will say, my other Senators have said upon this floor, I will carry this amendment, and a thousand others like it.

[illegible]

free republican principles, the force of which it would be difficult to answer, has advocated in this Senate the doctrine that there is an inherent right under the Constitution for the people of the Territories to determine their own form of government, and to elect their own representatives to govern themselves. He denounces the constitution of Congress to legislate for those Territories. The Senator from Indiana (Mr. PETTIT) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BADGER) differ in opinion from him; yet, that the Senator from Georgia said this morning, both agree, that it is the duty of Congress to give no aid or protection to the will of the people, even if we admit its existence. We find, then, that this principle of the independence and self-government of the people in the distant Territories of the Confederacy harmonizes all these various opinions, and enables us to banish from our halls of Congress another fertile source of discord and excitement.

When I find all these principles embraced in this bill, shall I jeopard them, shall I suffer them to remain at one moment's risk or hazard, for the single purpose of voting for this amendment, even though it recommends itself to my judgment? I can see neither wisdom nor policy in such a course.

What is the amendment? What is its extent or scope? I am astonished to hear a gentleman say that it is of such overriding importance. I am perfectly astonished in listening to the arguments addressed to the Senate by the Senator from Mississippi. He appealed to us to know whether any member upon this floor will agree to vote for a provision by which the outcast from Europe is to be al-

Territories, at the same time that Gen. Winfield Scott, he were there at the head of the armies of the United States, would be excluded from the same right? He put himself before the American people upon a ground like that. Sir, the Senator did not read the whole of the clause to which he referred. Where does he find in this bill an exclusion of the right of Gen. Winfield Scott, or any other American citizen, whether he belongs to the army or not to vote in the Territories? Is it in the concluding clause of the proviso? He left out six or seven words at the end of it:

"Provided further, That no officer, soldier, seaman, or marine, or other person in the army or navy of the United States, or attached to troops in the service of the United States, shall be allowed to vote or hold office in said Territory by reason of his being a citizen of the United States."

What is the meaning of this clause? I say that it is the fact of an officer or soldier being stationed there, and the command of the Government, shall not be construed into a legal residence such as will entitle him to exercise the right of suffrage. But, sir, suppose he is a resident in the Territory? He is not, unless he has taken anything in the bill to exonerate upon that service, is there any thing in the bill to exonerate upon that service? The Senator, therefore, has wandered from the amendment which the Senator from Maryland proposed, and has gone to the right of suffrage, and is very distinct. It is to that amendment that I am now referring, and I desire to address my self. What is the section proposed to be amended?

"Sec. 5. And be it further enacted, That every free white male inhabitant above the age of twenty-one years, who shall have been a resident of said Territory, and who shall possess the qualifications of electors in the State of New York, shall vote at the first election, and shall be eligible to the office of said Territory by the qualifications of voters as herein provided; and that the qualifications of voters shall be such as shall be prescribed by the Legislature of said Territory; and that the right of suffrage and of holding office shall be exercised only by citizens of the United States, and those who have been admitted to citizenship, and who have taken the oath, and shall have taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act."

There is the whole scope of the provision. We propose to organize these Territories. We propose to organize by a general system upon the principle of self-government; but we propose to give the people first a chance to meet and to order their own affairs. We must, in the origin, provide for the people and some mode by which the system of self-government is to be put in operation, leaving to the people afterwards under the provisions of the bill, to continue the form of government which they see fit, as to them shall seem best and most adapted to their own interest. The provision is, that as soon as the bill passes, upon the first meeting of the people, and before the Legislature is assembled, has acted upon the subject, any man may vote and be a resident of the Territory, and the Assembly provided his name is on the list, may become a citizen of the United States, and is sworn to support the Constitution of the United States and to observe the provisions of this act. I am free to confess that even in the case of the Territories, the principle of the provision does not reconcile itself to my judgment. I am not averse to the principle. As I could, as the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HUNTER) has said, exercise my individual judgment, and draft the provisions of a bill to suit myself alone, and, as an individual, I might impose the bill upon the Senate, I should certainly be as free to do so in the case of the Territories, as citizens of the United States; but inasmuch as we are to consult the opinions of all, as 'something must be given to the people, and as no one of us can expect the bill to be as well as perfect, according to his own judgment, in all of its parts, and as I will perfectly manage a sacrifice of this amendment for the purpose of obtaining the three great principles to which I have alluded,

[illegible][illegible]

Mr. DELL. I do not wish to tax the patience of the Senate, but I desire to say a word. I have listened with great interest to the eloquent, and conciliatory remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, and I desire to correct what I consider an unintentional misrepresentation of my whole course by the honorable Senator. He represents me as being in a state of doubt to the last moment, which he thinks are involved the great principles of the Union, and I think I am justified in saying that the honorable Senator has totally misrepresented me. My hesitation as to the course which I should take in regard to the bill was in deference to the opinions of the honorable Senator, in deference to what seemed to be the general voice of the Senate, and I think I am justified in Congress upon this question. The honorable Senator has witnessed enough to-day to know what I mean. My hesitation arose from my repugnance to a separation of friends, and friends, and not from any consideration of the principles involved. I think I am justified to think can be established by this bill. Sir, if I could have supposed that one-fourth part of the pleasing visions of peace, harmony, and prosperity which the honorable Senator has so eloquently and so judiciously painted out, this bill could be realized, I would have been the first, instead of hesitating to the last and going against him. The honorable Senator seems to have thought that I wished to provoke a general discussion on the merits of the bill, and I think I am justified in saying that the whole subject by his speech this evening.

I merely rose, however, to correct what seemed to be the mistaken apprehension of the honorable Senator from Louisiana. I know he did not mean to misrepresent me. My hesitation was for the good reason which I have stated, and which is in reference to the principles upon which I am established by this bill, but in which I think he is wholly mistaken.

By a new liquor law in Connecticut a man cannot sell less than five gallons of cider or wine made of his own currants or grapes. The ninth section *prohibits* that every man who keeps liquor intends to sell it. The county commissioners can authorize the manufacture of intoxicating liquors, but the manufacturer cannot sell it to any but his own family. The penalty is \$1,000 for each gallon. No person but a town agent can sell any liquor at all for any purpose whatever.

The Deceit. "News" comes to us clothed in mourning for the death of Elder WILLARD RICHARDS, one of the Mormon saints, who has some twenty desolate wives to mourn his loss. At his funeral Elder G. A. SMITH made a prayer, in which occurred the following petition in behalf of the bereaved:

"Bless the widows of thy servant Willard, who are called to part with a dear and beloved companion. Inquire them with the power of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom to bear with patience and resignation the trials they are called to contend for, and to live in such a manner as to prepare them to enjoy his society in the possession of thrones, principalities, and

H. R. SCHETTERLY.
GRAND TRAVERSE BAY, MICHIGAN.

SCHOOL BOOKS, in great variety, for sale by **TAYLOR & MAURY**, Pennsylvania avenue, near Ninth street.